



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/694,623	10/27/2003	Larry Lee Roundy	199-0215US	2613
29855 7590 03/17/2008 WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH, RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI, L.L.P. 20333 SH 249 SUITE 600 HOUSTON, TX 77070			EXAMINER RAMAKRISHNANAH, MELUR	
			ART UNIT 2614	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/17/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/694,623

Applicant(s)

ROUNDY ET AL.

Examiner

Melur Ramakrishnaiah

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Claim Objections

1. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: Dependent claim 6 depends on itself (i.e. on claim 6 itself). Appropriate correction is required.
2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
4. Claims 1-2, 3-4 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakamura et al. (US PAT: 5,539,811, hereinafter Nakamura).

Regarding claim 1, Nakamura discloses a method for processing incoming calls according to H.221 protocol (col. 4 lines 7-11) comprising: assigning a terminal address to an endpoint using terminal indicate assignment message in a first channel (reads on interchange of telephone numbers required to set up plural isdn channels between audio and video terminals: col. 5 lines 39-54), sending from the endpoint the address in a second channel (col. 6 lines 20-53).

Regarding claim 3, Nakamura discloses a processor based videoconferencing station (fig. 1) comprising a medium for storing instructions for causing the processor to: assign a terminal address to an endpoint using terminal indicate assignment message in a first channel (reads on interchange of telephone numbers required to set up plural isdn channels between audio and video terminals: col. 5 lines 39-54), receive from the endpoint the address in a second channel (col. 6 lines 20-53).

Regarding claim 5, Nakamura discloses a processor based videoconferencing station comprising: a receiver (17, fig. 1) for receiving incoming calls according to the H.221 protocol (col. 4 lines 7-11), a terminal address assignor (reads on 13, fig. 1), a transmitter for sending terminal indicate assignment message to an endpoint in a first channel, the terminal address provided by terminal address assignor (reads on interchange of telephone numbers required to set up plural isdn channels between audio and video terminals: col. 5 lines 39-54), an analyzer (reads on 15, fig. 1) to determine if the provided terminal address is sent from the end point (col. 6 lines 20-53).

Regarding claims 2, 4, 6, Nakamura further teaches the following: sending the address is accomplished through the use of a terminal address channel X message (reads on sending BAS code: col. 5 lines 55-60), analyzer (reads on 15, fig. 1) interprets a terminal indicate additional channel X message from the end point (col. 6 lines 20-53).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

--(4,979,170) to Gilhousen et al. discloses alternating sequential half duplex communication system which discloses central communication station employing a terminal assignment device which determines which terminals in the system a message is directed to and, accordingly assigns a terminal address to the message (col. 3, line 57 - col. 4, line 11).

--(US 2002/0064149) to Elliot et al. discloses a system and method for providing a requested quality of service in a hybrid network which discloses ITU H.221 frame structure (paragraph: 0420) and H.243 system for establishing communication between three or more audiovisual terminals (paragraph: 0426).

--(5,936,662) to Kim et al. discloses video conference control system and using an integrated digital network.

--(5,757,781) to Gilman et al. discloses dynamic insertion and removal of multimedia call handling resources into/from video calls to provide calling features.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melur Ramakrishnaiah whose telephone number is (571)272-8098. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 Hr schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curt Kuntz can be reached on (571) 272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2614

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Melur Ramakrishnaiah/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614